

Remarks

The following numbered paragraphs are provided to respond to the similarly numbered paragraphs in the Office Action (e.g., paragraph "1" below corresponds to paragraph 1 in the Office Action).

1. Applicant has amended each of claims 2, 4-6, 8-9, and 12 to address the Examiner's request for correction concerning the use of the term "positionable." Applicant has amended claim 1 to correct typographical errors.

2-8. The Office Action rejected each of claims 1-3, 6 and 13 as anticipated by Weber. Application respectfully yet strongly traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 requires, among other things, a light source that forms initial light rays that are essentially perpendicular to a first direction and a guidance member that redirects the initial light rays so that the rays exit the guidance member along paths that have a lateral component aligned with the first direction where the first direction is along a first dimension of an essentially flat surface and where the redirected rays subtend the flat surface. To this end, see Figs. 1 and 2 of the present specification where initial rays 40 are perpendicular to first direction 50 and redirected rays 42 travel along paths that have a lateral component aligned with first direction 50 and that subtend illuminated segment 26'. Thus, the redirected rays have to have a component that is along the first direction (i.e., along the first dimension of the flat surface) and that subtend the flat surface.

Turning to Weber, Weber fails to teach or suggest a guidance member having the characteristics required by claim 1. In this regard, referring to Weber's Fig. 1, the Office Action indicates that member 25 is akin to the claimed guidance member and that source 20 is akin to the claimed light source. While member 25 indeed redirects light rays, member 25 neither receives initial rays that are perpendicular to the first direction (i.e., the first direction being perpendicular to direction "f" in Weber's Fig. 1) nor generates redirected rays that subtend the illuminated portion of the object being illuminated. Instead, the initial beam generated by source 20 is redirected twice (i.e., once by member 22 and a second time by wheel 16) prior to being redirected by member 25 and, by the time the rays subtended member 25, with the possible exception of one central ray, the intercepted rays are not

perpendicular to the first direction (i.e., the direction aligned with the width of member 27 perpendicular to direction f). Moreover, while most of the rays redirected by member 25 have a lateral component aligned with the first direction, the central ray appears to remain perpendicular to the first direction (see again Weber's Fig. 1). Furthermore, while claim 1 requires that the redirected rays that subtend the flat surface of the object being illuminated have a lateral component aligned with the first direction, Weber's configuration results in rays that are perpendicular to the first direction and that have no lateral component as required by claim 1. Here note that beam 26 in Weber forms an angle with direction "f" but is perpendicular to scanning line 11 where scanning line 11 is aligned with the first direction.

Applicant recognizes here that, in rejecting claim 3, the Examiner has indicated that a beam includes parallel rays. With respect to claim 1, even if the central ray or beam emanating from Weber's wheel 16 were construed as including a plurality of parallel rays that are perpendicular to the first direction, when the central beam rays are redirected by member 25, the redirected rays remain perpendicular to the first direction and hence do not include a lateral component aligned with the first direction as required by claim 1 (see the middle ray or beam in Weber's Fig. 1 that is perpendicular to scanning line 11 as the middle beam emanates from member 25). Moreover, even when interpreted in this fashion, the rays that eventually subtend Weber's flat surface 17 do not have a lateral component as required by claim 1 and instead are perpendicular to the first direction (i.e., the direction along scanning line 11).

Thus, Weber fails to teach or suggest a guidance member that intercepts the initial rays and redirects the rays so that the redirected rays subtend the flat surface of an object to be illuminated. In addition, Weber fails to teach a guidance member that both intercepts the initial rays that are perpendicular to the first direction and that generates redirected rays having a component along the first direction. Moreover, Weber fails to teach or suggest a configuration that generates rays that both subtend an object to be illuminated and that have a lateral component aligned with a first direction as claimed.

Thus, for the reasons described above Applicant believes that claim 1 and claims dependent therefrom are patently distinct from Weber.

9-10. The Office Action rejected claim 7 as obvious over Weber. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 7 limits the guidance member to a prismatic film. Nothing in Weber teaches or suggests a prismatic film for redirecting light and, in fact, Applicant believes that if a prismatic film were swapped for Weber's member 25, Weber's configuration would not operate properly. To this end, Applicant notes that light is reflected in two different directions by member 25. First, light from wheel 16 is directed toward member 15. Second, return light from member 15 is redirected toward member 17. In addition, the light redirected by member 25 has different magnitude longitudinal and lateral components and Applicant is unaware of any prismatic film that could redirect light in both directions where the trajectories are so diverse. For this reason also Applicant believes claim 7 is patentable over Weber.

Applicant has introduced no new matter in making the above amendments and antecedent basis exists in the specification and claims as originally filed for each amendment. In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant believes the pending claims of the present application recite patentable subject matter and allowance of the same is requested. No fee in addition to the fees already authorized in this and accompanying documentation is believed to be required to enter this amendment, however, if an additional fee is required, please charge Deposit Account No. 17-0055 in the amount of the fee.

Respectfully submitted,

MICHAEL P. NETTEKOVEN

Date: 11-18-04

By: 

Michael A. Jaskolski
Reg. No. 37,551
Attorney for Applicant
QUARLES & BRADY, LLP
411 East Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee, WI. 53202-4497
(414) 277-5711